arXiv:1301.4578v5 [math.FA] 9 Feb 2013

AN EXTENDED KANNAN FIXED POINT THEOREM

SRIRAM BALASUBRAMANIAN

Abstract. We prove an extended Kannan fixed point theorem for a weakly complete generalized cone rectangular metric space, without the normality assumption on the cone. Our work generalizes the results of Jleli & Samet in [18].

1. Introduction

A well-known fixed point theorem for metric spaces is the Banach contraction mapping theorem, which states that if (X, d) is a complete metric space and the map $T : X \to X$ is a contraction, i.e. $d(Tx, Ty) \leq \lambda d(x, y)$ for some $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ and all $x, y \in X$, then there exists a unique fixed point for the map T. In [19], Kannan considered a self-map T on a complete metric space (X, d) that satisfies

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha\{d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)\}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. He proved that there exists a unique fixed point for the map T, if $\alpha \in [0, 1/2)$. Several successful attempts have been made to improve the Banach and Kannan fixed point theorems, mainly along three different directions: (a) by finding better contractivity conditions on the map T, (b) by replacing the underlying metric space with a more general space, for example - a partial metric space, a generalized metric space, an ordered metric space etc., and (c) by relaxing the completeness assumption. A small sample of such results can be found in [4] - [13], [21].

In [16], Huang and Zhang introduced the notion of a (normal) cone metric, which is more general than a metric, and proved the Banach contraction mapping theorem for that setting. This initiated a series of articles generalizing the Banach, Kannan and other fixed point theorems to (normal) cone metric spaces. Hamlbarani and Rezapur Sh., in [22], further generalized the results of [16] by dropping the normality assumption of the cone. Following the work of Branciari in [7], Azam et al. in [3], introduced the notion of a cone rectangular metric, which is obtained by replacing the triangle inequality in the definition of a cone metric by a rectangular inequality, i.e. an inequality that involves four points and proved the Banach fixed point

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47H10, 54H25 (Primary). 37C25(Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Fixed Point, Kannan, Contraction, Cone Metric Spaces, Cone Rectangular Metric Spaces.

theorem for cone rectangular metric spaces. Jleli and Samet in [18] proved the Kannan fixed point theorem for such spaces. Inspired by [22], in this article, we consider a generalized cone rectangular metric space and prove an extended Kannan fixed point theorem, without assuming that the cone is normal. Our work generalizes the results of Jleli and Samet in [18]. The proofs given in this article rely more on the topology of the generalized cone rectangular metric space being considered as opposed to those in articles containing similar results for (normal) cone rectangular metric spaces, which rely more on the norm of the real Banach space, which the rectangular metric takes values in.

2. Preliminaries and The Main Result

Let E be a real Banach space. A non-empty closed subset P of E is said to be a *cone* if

- (a) $P + P \subset P$
- (b) $\alpha P \subset P$ for all $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$
- (c) $P \cap (-P) = \{0\}$.

The cone P is said to be *solid* if the interior of P, which we will denote by *int* P, is non-empty.

Examples of Solid Cones:

1. Let $E = \mathbb{R}$ and $P = [0, \infty)$.
2. Let $E = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $P = \{(x, y) : x, y \geq 0\}$.
3. Let E be the space of all $n \times n$ real symmetric matrices and P be the set of all positive semi-definite matrices in E.
4. Let E be the space of all $n \times n$ real matrices P be the set of all matrices in E with non-negative entries.

A cone P in a real Banach space E, induces the following partial order $\leq$ on E. For $x, y \in E$,

$$x \leq y \Leftrightarrow y - x \in P.$$

In the case of a solid cone P, we will use the notation $x \ll y$ to denote $y - x \in \mathit{int}\, P$.

A cone P is said to be *normal* if for all $x, y \in P$ such that $x \leq y$, there exists a constant $\kappa \geq 1$ such that $\|x\| \leq \kappa \|y\|$. The examples (1) and (2) above are normal cones with $\kappa = 1$. An example of a cone that is not normal is the following (See [22]). Let E be the real Banach space $C'[0, 1]$ with the norm defined as $\|f\| = \|f\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty$ and P be the cone $\{f : f \geq 0\}$.

Let X be a nonempty set, E be a real Banach space and $P \subset E$ be a solid cone. A map $d : X \times X \to E$ is said to be a *generalized cone rectangular metric*, if there exists $s \geq 1$ such that for all $x, y \in X$ and for all distinct elements $u, v \in X \setminus \{x, y\}$,

(a) $d(x,y) \geq 0$, i.e. $d(x,y) \in P$.
(b) $d(x,y) = 0$ if and only if $y = x$.
(c) $d(x,y) \leq d(x,u) + s\, d(u,v) + d(v,w)$.

The pair (X,d) is called a *generalized cone rectangular metric space.*

Example: Let $X = \{1,2,3,4\}$, E and P be as in Example (2) above. Define $d : X \times X \to E$ by

$$d(1,2) = d(2,1) = (4,6);$$
$$d(1,3) = d(1,4) = d(2,3) = d(2,4) = d(3,4) = (1,1);$$
$$d(k,k) = 0 \text{ and } d(i,j) = d(j,i);\ \ i,j,k \in X.$$

It can easily be verified that (X,d) is a generalized cone rectangular metric space with $s = 4$.

Remark 1. *Note that if we take $s = 1$ in the definition of the generalized cone rectangular metric d, we recover the definition of a cone rectangular metric, which was introduced by Azam et al. in* [3]. *Thus the collection of all generalized cone rectangular metric spaces includes all the cone rectangular metric spaces. Moreover, the inclusion is strict. Observe that for the example above,*

$$d(1,2) \not\leq d(1,3) + d(3,4) + d(4,2).$$

i.e. (X,d) in the example above, is not a cone rectangular metric space.

The following is the main result of this article, which concerns a *weakly complete generalized cone rectangular metric space.* i.e. a space where every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ converges to some x in the space, in the following weak sense namely, given a neighborhood U of x *of a certain type*, there exists a natural number N such that $x_n \in U$ for all $n \geq N$. Please see Section 4 for the actual definition of *weak convergence.*

Theorem 1. *Let (X,d) be a weakly complete cone rectangular metric space. If the map $T : X \times X \to X$ satisfies*

$$d(Tx,Ty) \leq \alpha d(x,Tx) + \beta d(y,Ty) + \gamma d(y,Tx), \tag{1}$$

and

$$d(Tx,Ty) \leq \beta d(x,Tx) + \alpha d(y,Ty) + \gamma d(x,Ty), \tag{2}$$

where $0 \leq \alpha + \beta < 1$ and $\gamma \in [0,1)$, then T has a unique fixed point.

The proof of the above Theorem is given in Section 5. It generalizes the main result of Jleli and Sammet in [18]. One recovers the main result of [18] by taking $\alpha = \beta$ and $\gamma = 0$. Moreover, here we do not assume the solid cone P to be normal, as was the case in [18].

Remark 2. *If the partial order $\leq$ induced by the solid cone P in the real Banach space E is also a total order (i.e. given $x, y \in E$, either $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$) and $\alpha = \beta$, then inequalities (1) and (2) can be replaced by*

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha(d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)) + \gamma \min\{d(y, Tx), d(x, Ty)\}. \tag{3}$$

One such cone is Example (1) given on page 1.

3. Some Properties of a Cone in a Real Banach Space

This section contains some well-known properties of a cone P in a real Banach space E. A few more of them can be found in [16], [17].

Lemma 1. *Let E be a real Banach space and P be a cone in E.*

- (i) $P + int\, P \subset int\, P$
- (ii) $\alpha\, (int\, P) \subset int\, P$ *for all* $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$.
- (iii) *If* $u \in P$ *and* $u \leq ku$ *for some* $k \in [0, 1)$, *then* $u = 0$.

Proof. (i) Let $u \in P$ and $v \in int\, P$. Consider the bijective continuous map $f : E \to E$ defined by $f(x) = x - u$. Let U be an open set contained in P containing $v = f(u + v)$. By continuity of f, we get that $f^{-1}(U)$ is an open subset of E. It suffices to show that $f^{-1}(U) \subset P$. The desired result will then follow by observing that $u + v \in f^{-1}(U)$. Let $z \in f^{-1}(U)$. Since f is a bijection, $z = y + u$ for some $y \in U$. Thus $z = y + u \in U + P \subset P + P \subset P$.

(ii) Let $u \in int\, P$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B(u, \epsilon) = \{x : \|x - u\| < \epsilon\} \subset P$. If we take $\delta = \alpha\epsilon$, then for $z \in B(\alpha u, \delta)$, it follows that

$$\|u - (1/\alpha)z\| = \frac{1}{\alpha}(\|\alpha u - z\|) < \frac{1}{\alpha}\delta = \epsilon.$$

Thus $(1/\alpha)z \in B(u, \epsilon) \subset P$. Since P is a cone it follows that $\alpha(1/\alpha)z = z \in P$.

(iii) The hypotheses imply that $u, (k - 1)u \in P$. Since P is a cone it follows that $\left(\frac{1}{1-k}\right)(k - 1)u \in P$. i.e. $-u \in P$. The result now follows from the fact that $P \cap (-P) = \{0\}$. □

Lemma 2. *Let E be a real Banach space, P be a solid cone in E and $u, v, w \in E$.*

- (i) *If* $0 \ll v \leq u$, *then* $0 \ll u$. *i.e.* $u \in int\, P$.
- (ii) *If* $u \leq v$ *and* $v \ll w$, *then* $u \ll w$.
- (iii) *If* $0 \leq u \ll c$ *for all* $c \gg 0$, *then* $u = 0$.
- (iv) *If* (x_n) *is a sequence in E such that* $x_n \geq 0$ *and* $x_n \to 0$, *then given* $c \gg 0$, *there exists* $N \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $x_n \ll c$ *for all* $n \geq N$.

Proof. (i) Since $u = (u - v) + v \in P + int\, P$, it follows from part (i) of Lemma 1, that $u \in int\, P$.

(ii) Since $w - v \in int\,P$ and $w - u \geq w - v$, it follows from part (i) that $u \ll w$.

(iii) Since $u \ll c$ for all $c \in int\,P$, it follows from part (ii) of Lemma 1 that $u \ll \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) c$.
i.e. $u_n = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) c - u \in int\,P$. Since P is closed, it follows that $-u = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} u_n \in P$. Thus $u \in P \cap (-P) = \{0\}$.

(iv) Fix $c \gg 0$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $c + B(0,\delta) \subset int\,P$. Such a δ exists because $c \in int\,P$. Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|x_n\| < \delta$ for all $n \geq N$. It follows that $x_n \ll c$ for all $n \geq N$. $\square$

4. More on generalized cone rectangular metric spaces

Recall the definition of a generalized cone rectangular metric space given in Section 2. For $x \in X$ and $c \gg 0$, define $B(x,c) = \{y : d(x,y) \ll c\} \subset X$. The collection $\mathcal{B} = \{B(x,c) : x \in X, c \gg 0\}$ being a subbasis generates a topology on X, say Γ. Note that Γ consists of all unions of finite intersections of elements of $\mathcal{B}$. In particular $\mathcal{B} \subset \Gamma$. We will henceforth view (X,Γ) as a topological space. That whether the topological space (X,Γ) is Hausdorff, remains to be seen.

A sequence (x_n) in a generalized cone rectangular metric space X is said to be *Cauchy*, if given $c \gg 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, which is independent of k, such that $d(x_n, x_{n+k}) \ll c$ whenever $n \geq N$.

A sequence (x_n) in a generalized cone rectangular metric space X is said to *converge weakly* to $x \in X$, if given $c \gg 0$, there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(x_n, x) \ll c$ for all $n \geq N$. i.e. $x_n \in B(x,c)$ for all $n \geq N$. We will denote (x_n) converging weakly to x by $x_n \twoheadrightarrow x$.

A generalized cone rectangular metric space X is said to be *weakly complete* if every Cauchy sequence in the space converges weakly.

Example: Let (X,d) be the generalized cone rectangular metric space given in the Example in Section 2. It can easily be verified that the only Cauchy sequences in X are the eventually constant sequences, which of course converge weakly in X. Thus (X,d) is a complete generalized cone rectangular metric space.

Remark 3. *For a general topological space Y, one says that a sequence (x_n) in Y converges to x if and only if given any open set U containing x, there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_n \in U$, for all $n \geq N$. Observe that for our purposes, we only consider a weaker form of convergence. The type of convergence defined above is weaker, because we demand the existence of an*

$N \in \mathbb{N}$ not for all, but only for certain open sets containing x, namely, sets of the form $B(x, c)$.

Remark 4. *If the generalized cone rectangular metric space (X, d) is in fact, a cone metric space, i.e. if d satisfies conditions (a) and (b) in the definition of a generalized cone rectangular metric space and the triangle inequality $d(x, y) \leq d(x, a) + d(a, y)$ for all $x, y, a \in X$, in place of (c), then the definitions of weak convergence and weak completeness agree with those of (topological) convergence and completeness. This can be seen by observing that in this case, the collection $\mathcal{B} = \{B(x, c) : x \in X, c \gg 0\}$, is in fact, a basis for Γ. For more details see* [16].

Lemma 3. *Let (x_n) be a Cauchy sequence of distinct points in a generalized cone rectangular metric space X. If $x, y \notin \{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and (x_n) converges weakly to both x and y, then $x = y$.*

Proof. Given $c \gg 0$, by the hypotheses, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(x, x_n) \ll c/3$, $d(x_m, x_{m+1}) \ll (c/3s)$ and $d(x_\ell, y) \ll c/3$, for all $m, n, \ell \geq N$. Using part (i) of Lemma 1 and part (ii) of Lemma 2, it follows that

$$d(x, y) \leq d(x, x_N) + sd(x_N, x_{N+1}) + d(x_{N+1}, y) \ll c.$$

An application of part (iii) of Lemma 2, completes the proof. ☐

Lemma 4. *Let (x_n) be a sequence in a generalized cone rectangular metric space (X, d). If there exists a sequence (y_n) in E converging to 0 such that $d(x_n, x_{n+k}) \leq y_n$ for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, then (x_n) is a Cauchy Sequence.*

Proof. From part (iv) of Lemma 2, it follows that for a given $c \gg 0$, there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $y_n \ll c$ for all $n \geq N$. Thus for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq N$, we get $d(x_n, x_{n+k}) \leq y_n \ll c$. The result now follows from part (ii) of Lemma 2. ☐

5. Proof of The Main Result

This section contains a proof of our main result stated in Section 2. A part of it has been adapted from [18]. Although, almost all fixed point theorems for cone or rectangular cone metric spaces are proved with the normality assumption on the underlying cone, here we do not make this assumption. However the central idea remains the same. We indeed produce a Cauchy sequence that converges (weakly) in our target space and show that the limit is the desired unique fixed point.

Proof of Theorem 1. First we prove uniqueness of the fixed point. Suppose that $x, y \in X$ are fixed points of T. From inequality (1), it follows that

$$d(x, y) \leq \alpha d(x, Tx) + \beta d(y, Ty) + \gamma d(y, Tx) = \gamma d(y, x).$$

By part (iii) of Lemma 1, it follows that $d(x, y) = 0$, i.e. $x = y$.

For the proof of existence of a fixed point for the map T, consider the sequence $(T^n x)$ in X. Let $\delta = \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}$. Note that $\delta \in [0,1)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, using inequality (1), we get

$$d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) \leq \alpha d(T^{n-1}x, T^n x) + \beta d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) + \gamma d(T^n x, T^n x).$$

Thus for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) \leq \delta d(T^{n-1}x, T^n x).$$

Iterating we get,

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) &\leq \delta d(T^{n-1}x, T^n x) \\ &\leq \delta^2 d(T^{n-2}x, T^{n-1}x) \\ &\;\;\vdots \\ &\leq \delta^n d(x, Tx). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Without loss of generality, one can assume that the sequence $(T^n x)$ consists of distinct elements. This is because if $T^m x = T^n x$ for some $m > n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) &= d(T^{m-n}(T^n x), T^{m-n+1}(T^n x) \\ &\leq \delta^{m-n} d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x). \end{aligned}$$

By part (iii) of Lemma 1, it follows that $d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) = 0$, i.e. $T^n x$ is a fixed point of T. Henceforth, we will assume $T^n x \neq T^m x$ for any $n \neq m$.

Next we prove that the sequence $(T^n x)$ is a Cauchy sequence in X. Consider $d(T^n x, T^{n+k}x)$.

Suppose that $k = 2m + 1$ for some $m \geq 0$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x, T^{n+k}x) &\leq d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) + s\, d(T^{n+1}x, T^{n+2}x) + d(T^{n+2}x, T^{n+3}x) \\ &\quad + s\, d(T^{n+3}x, T^{n+4}x) + \cdots + d(T^{n+2m}x, T^{n+2m+1}x) \\ &\leq s\,\{d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) + d(T^{n+1}x, T^{n+2}x) + d(T^{n+2}x, T^{n+3}x) \\ &\quad + d(T^{n+3}x, T^{n+4}x) + \cdots + d(T^{n+2m}x, T^{n+2m+1}x)\} \\ &\leq s\,(\delta^n + \delta^{n+1} + \cdots + \delta^{n+2m})\, d(x, Tx) \\ &\leq \frac{2s\delta^n}{1-\delta}\, d(x, Tx) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Suppose that $k = 2$. Using the inequality (1) and the facts $0 \leq \alpha, \beta, \gamma \leq 1$ and $\alpha \leq \delta$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x, T^{n+2}x) &\leq \alpha d(T^{n-1}x, T^n x) + \beta d(T^{n+1}x, T^{n+2}x) + \gamma d(T^{n+1}x, T^n x) \\ &\leq (\alpha\delta^{n-1} + \delta^{n+1} + \delta^n)\, d(x, Tx) \\ &\leq 2(\delta^n + \delta^{n+1})\, d(x, Tx). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Suppose that $k = 2m$ for some $m \geq 1$. Using inequality (6), we get,

(7)

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x, T^{n+k} x) &\leq d(T^n x, T^{n+2} x) + s\, d(T^{n+2} x, T^{n+3} x) + d(T^{n+3} x, T^{n+4} x) \\ &+ s\, d(T^{n+4} x, T^{n+5} x) + \cdots + d(T^{n+2m-1} x, T^{n+2m} x) \\ &\leq s\, \{d(T^n x, T^{n+2} x) + d(T^{n+2} x, T^{n+3} x) + d(T^{n+3} x, T^{n+4} x) \\ &+ d(T^{n+4} x, T^{n+5} x) + \cdots + d(T^{n+2m-1} x, T^{n+2m} x)\} \\ &\leq s\, \{2(\delta^n + \delta^{n+1}) + \delta^{n+2} + \cdots + \delta^{n+2m}\}\, d(x, Tx) \\ &\leq \frac{2s\delta^n}{1-\delta}\, d(x, Tx). \end{aligned}$$

Let (y_n) be the sequence $\left(\frac{2s\delta^n}{1-\delta}\, d(x, Tx)\right)$. Note that (y_n) is a sequence in the Banach space E that converges to 0. Moreover, it follows from inequalities (5) and (7) that

$$d(T^n x, T^{n+k} x) \leq y_n, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Taking $(x_n) = (T^n x)$ in Lemma 4 implies that the sequence $(T^n x)$ is Cauchy in X. Since X is weakly complete, there exists $u \in X$ such that $T^n x \twoheadrightarrow u$. Note that the uniqueness of the limit u of the sequence $(T^n x)$ is guaranteed by Lemma 3. Our next claim is that u is a fixed point of T.

Recall that $(T^n x)$ is a sequence in X of distinct points. Suppose that $u = T^m x$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For a given $c \gg 0$, let $N_1, N_2 \geq m+2$, be such that

$$d(u, T^n x) \ll \frac{(1-\beta)c}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad d(T^\ell x, T^{\ell+1} x) \ll \frac{(1-\beta)c}{6s}, \tag{8}$$

for all $n \geq N_1$ and $\ell \geq N_2$. Let $N = \max(N_1, N_2) \geq m+2$.

By using inequality (1) we obtain,

(9)

$$\begin{aligned} d(u, Tu) &\leq d(u, T^N x) + s d(T^N x, T^{N+1} x) + d(T^{N+1} x, Tu) \\ &\leq d(u, T^N x) + s d(T^N x, T^{N+1} x) + \alpha d(T^N x, T^{N+1} x) \\ &+ \beta d(u.Tu) + \gamma d(u, T^{N+1} x) \\ &\leq d(u, T^N x) + 2s\, d(T^N x, T^{N+1} x) + \beta d(u, Tu) + d(u, T^{N+1} x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$d(u, Tu) \leq \frac{1}{1-\beta}\{d(u, T^N x) + d(u, T^{N+1} x)\} + \frac{2s}{1-\beta} d(T^N x, T^{N+1} x) \ll c.$$

By part (iii) of Lemma 2, it follows that $d(u, Tu) = 0$, i.e. $T^m u = T^{m+1} u$. This is a contradiction to the fact that the sequence $(T^n x)$ in X consists of distinct elements. Thus $u \neq T^n x$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose that $Tu = T^m x$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be as above. Using inequality (1) and the fact that $u \neq T^n x$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from an argument similar to (9), that $d(u, Tu) \ll c$.

By part (iii) of Lemma 2, it follows that $d(u, Tu) = 0$, i.e. $u = Tu = T^m x$. This contradicts the fact proved above namely, $T^n x \neq u$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Henceforth, we will assume that $(T^n x)$ is in fact a sequence of distinct terms in $X \setminus \{u, Tu\}$. Suppose that $u \neq Tu$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that inequalities in (8) hold for all $n, \ell \geq N$. An argument as in (9) and an application of part (iii) of Lemma 2 yields,

$$d(u, Tu) = 0,$$

a contradiction to our assumption that u is not a fixed point of T. Thus indeed, $u = Tu$, and this completes the proof. $\square$

References

[1] M. Abbas and G. Jungck, Common fixed point results for non commuting mappings without continuity in cone metric spaces, J. Math. Anal. Appl., vol. 341, pp.416-420, 2008.

[2] M. Abbas and B.E. Rhoades, Fixed and periodic point results in cone metric spaces, Appl. Math. Lett., 22(2009), 511-515.

[3] A. Azam, M. Arshad and I. Beg, Banach contraction principle on cone rectangular metric spaces, Appl. Anal. Discrete Math., 3(2009), No.2, 236-241.

[4] D. F. Bailey, Some theorems on contractive mappings, J. London Math. Soc. 41 (1966), 101-106, MR 32, 6434.

[5] L. P. Belluce and W. A. Kirk, Fixed-point theorems for certain classes of nonexpansive mappings, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 20 (1969), 141-146, MR 38, 1663.

[6] D. W. Boyd and J. S. W. Wong, On nonlinear contractions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 20 (1969), 458-464, MR 39, 916.

[7] Branciari A., A fixed point theorem of Banach-Cacciopoli type on a class of generalized metric spaces , Publ. Math. Debrecen., (57) 1-2 (2000), 31-37.

[8] S. K. Chatterjea, Fixed-pointh theorems, C. R. Acad., Bulgare Sci., 25 (1972), 727-730, MR 48, 2845.

[9] S. K. Chatterjea, Fixed point theorems for a sequence of mappings with contractive iterates, Publ. Inst Math. (Beograd), 14 (28) (1972), 15-18.

[10] L. B. Ciric, Generalized contractions and fixed-point theorems, Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.) 12 (26) (1971), 19-26, MR 46, 8203.

[11] L.B. Ciric, A generalization of Banach's contraction principle, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 45 (1974), 267-273, MR 50, 8484.

[12] M. Edelstein, An extension of Banach's contraction principle, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 12 (1960),7-10. MR 22, 11375.

[13] M. Edelstein, On fixed and periodic points under contractive mappings, J. London Math. Soc. 37 (1962), 74-79, MR 24, A2936

[14] J. Eisenfeld and V. Lakshmikantham, Fixed point theorems through abstract cones, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 52(1975), 25-35.

[15] H. Huang, S.Xu, Fixed point theorems of contractive mappings in cone b-metric spaces and applications, Fixed Point Theory and Applications 2012, 2012:220.

[16] L.-G. Huang, X. Zhang, Cone metric spaces and fixed point theorems of contractive mappings, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 332 (2007) 1468-1476.

[17] S. Jankovic, Z. Kadelburg and S. Radenovic, On cone metric spaces: A survey, Nonlinear Analysis, vol. 74, pp. 2591-2601, 2011.

[18] M. Jleli and B. Samet, The Kannan fixed point theorem in a cone rectangular metric space, J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl., 2(2009), No.3, 161-167.

[19] R. Kannan, Some results on fixed points, Bulletin of the Calcutta Math. Soc., 60(1968), 71-76.

[20] M.A. Khamsi, Remarks on cone metric spaces and fixed point theorems of contractive mappings, Fixed Point Theory Appl., 2010(2010), Article ID 315398, 7 pages.

[21] Rhoades, B.E., A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings, Tran. Amer. Math. Soc., 226, 1977.

[22] Rezapour, Sh., Hamlbarani, R., Some notes on the paper: "Cone metric spaces and fixed point theorems of contractive mappings" [J. Math. Anal. Appl. 332 (2007), no. 2, 14681476; MR2324351] by L.-G. Huang and X. Zhang, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 345 (2008), no. 2, 719724.

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Kolkata, India.

E-mail address: `bsriram@iiserkol.ac.in`